

No. 5:13-CV-454-FL

Defendants.

ORDER


Case 5:13-cv-00454-H Document 5 Filed 07/02/13 Page 1 of 2

delaying tactics, and their slightest involvement at this time would guarantee that no TRO would be entered immediately.” Pls.’ Supplemental Mem. Supp. Mot. TRO 3. The court takes note of a separate lawsuit initiated by plaintiff Celeste G. Broughton June 7, 2010, against two of the three defendants named herein, which concluded in favor of defendants, upon judgment of the court, affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. In that action, this plaintiff raised certain challenges renewed here.

Plaintiffs have not shown reason why notice should not be required. The filings tendered in support of the drastic relief requested also are incomplete. As such, circumstances evidencing clear demand for this extraordinary remedy, without notice, have not been shown. See Steakhouse, Inc., v. City of Raleigh, 166 F.3d 634, 637 (4th Cir. 1999) (“The grant of interim relief is an extraordinary remedy involving the exercise of a very far-reaching power, which is to be applied only in the limited circumstances which clearly demand it.”). Plaintiffs’ motion for a TRO is DENIED.

The court HOLDS IN ABEYANCE decision on plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction, pending issuance of summonses and plaintiffs’ showing, as required, of proper service in the case, including all filings by plaintiffs together with a copy of this order. Upon such showing, the court may order expedited briefing, as appropriate, to aid in efficient decision on the motion.

SO ORDERED, this the 2nd day of July, 2013.


LOUISE W. FLANAGAN
United States District Judge